

stories in height. The retail unit with flat above would be two storey with a pitched hipped roof. The access to serve this and the 44 flats to the rear is proposed between this replacement frontage unit and 112 Elm Grove to the north. The car park between 106 and 108 Elm Grove is excluded from the application site and is proposed for retention with 104 and 106 Elm Grove.

- 3.2 The sheltered apartment block comprises a courtyard approach. The main frontage elevation to the west is mainly 3 storey in height but steps down to two and then single storey elements to each side with a succession of hipped roofs. When viewed from the south the building is predominantly 3 storey but the third storey is provided within a half-dormered roof construction. This element is set away from the southern boundary by a distance of 14.5m and has the main garden area located between the building and the boundary. The northern elevation is separated into a number of distinct elements by extending the gable ends at the east and west ends beyond the central frontage and providing some variance in the plan depth. This elevation is designed as 3 storey. The east elevation has the shortest frontage and is predominantly 3 storey although it steps down to 2 storey at its southern end.
- 3.3 The approach to the design is traditional with details such as stone window cills, stone window heads, brick window heads, projecting horizontal band detailing, chimney stacks and areas of vertical tile hanging. At ground floor, flats are provided with glazed door units and small discrete private patio areas. Materials are proposed as a mixture of red and stock bricks, render, red and brown concrete tiles with grey slate effect tile for central roofs and some of the lower roofs.
- 3.4 The flats are provided with 14 car parking spaces and pedestrian access is taken though the car park to the main entrance of the building, sited at the southern end of the main frontage. A second access for residents is provided to the front of the north elevation and an amendment has provided a defined footway through to this entrance which will be protected by a porch detail. The flat and commercial unit is provided with 3 parking spaces to the rear, served from the main access for the development.
- 3.5 The application is supported by a number of documents:
 - Affordable Housing & Viability Statement
 - Housing Needs Assessment
 - Archaeological Desk Based Assessment
 - Transport Statement
 - Landscaping Strategy
 - Ecology Report
 - Contamination Desk Study
 - Flood Risk Assessment
 - Design and Access Statement

The application has also been supplemented by further parking information in respect of the use of the St Mary's Road public car park which lies nearby the site, and a Report into the Assessment of Bat Potential in the Trees. An offer has been made to make a financial contribution in lieu of affordable housing, which is being reviewed by a third party, and a contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011
CS16 (High Quality Design)

CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS20	(Transport and Access Strategy)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS4	()
CS9	(Housing)
DM11	(Planning for More Sustainable Travel)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)
DM2	(Protection of Existing Community Facilities and Shops)
DM7	(Elderly and Specialist Housing Provision)
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

HY1	(Hayling Island Housing Allocations)
AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM24	(Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)
AL3	(Town, District and Local Centres)

Havant Borough Design Guide SPD

Havant Borough Housing SPD

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control, (Fire Access Consultation):

Potential fire brigade access issues towards the eastern end of the building. No public sewer in the area.

County Archaeologist:

No archaeological issues

Hayling Health Centre:

No response received

Economic Development - Retail and Town Centres:

It is doubtful if a retailer wishes to take on the existing site, and if there has been no interest, the proposal is reluctantly supported.

Environmental Health Manager

The submissions leave uncertainty regarding SUDs feasibility and therefore a condition is proposed requiring approval of SUDs design in order to demonstrate how drainage is to be provided. On the matter of energy provision an air-source scheme is preferred to a ground source heat pump in view of ground condition considerations. Noise details of any air-source scheme would be required by condition. An informative is requested to provide advice on the treatment of any asbestos found during demolition. The development is unlikely to represent an adverse impact on air quality. In view of the previous use of the site, particularly the rear area for storage and builder's yard contamination mitigation conditions are requested.

Hampshire Fire & Rescue

Fire access will be dealt with under the Building Regulations. Advice provided for

information with respect to access for high reach appliances, water supplies, sprinklers, fire fighting and the environment and timber framed buildings.

Development Engineer - Highways

Layout

The total parking number meets the one space per 4 units (0.25 per unit) which is the historic standard we have used for similar developments within Havant (with a minimum age condition). This standard is not referred to in the HBC Parking Standards. This application is for 44 units with 14 spaces (0.32 spaces per unit). In the determination of a 2007 Havant Planning Appeal Decisions for a Churchill Retirement Living in New Brighton Road, Emsworth the Inspector accepted 12 spaces for 34 units (0.35 spaces per unit).

I would suggest the proposed parking is acceptable however the area of hard standing for car parking needs to be modified to enable vehicles including cars, emergency vehicles, delivery vehicles, refuse lorries to turn on site and emerge onto Elm Grove in a forward gear.

The site should also have long and short time storage for cycles.

There should be provision made for the storage and charging of mobility scooters.

I note that there are electric gates shown between the shop parking turning/parking area and the residents parking service area. Service vehicles waiting to gain entrance through the gates will cause congestion and possibly reversing into the highway causing highway safety problems

I would suggest a separate footpath should be provided for the residents. It should be of a width to accommodate wheelchairs.

If the above points could be resolved the Highway Authority would have no adverse comment on this application.

Traffic Generation

Original comments: The original Traffic Assessment makes reference to the availability of the St Marys Road public car park for visitors (which will include medical, carers and tradesmen etc.) but the number of these trips are not quantified. This information is required to evaluate the availability of this car park for Elm Grove shoppers and therefore its impact on the economic viability of the area.

Comments following receipt of further information: The survey of St Mary's Road car park shows there is sufficient space in the St Marys Car park. So if we accept the principle that the car park is for the multi use of the public there is no reason for refusal.

Housing:

The proposal would need to comply with Local Plan policy CS9.2 and provide 30 - 40% affordable housing on-site; this would equate to a minimum of 14 units. If an offer included a majority of 1 bedroom units this would be acceptable. Demand in the borough for affordable sheltered accommodation was 279 applicants registered with HHC as at 24/9/2015 and the number has risen consistently since 2012. This is partly attributed to the 'bedroom tax'. There is therefore a demand for sheltered flats from the social sector. However, an argument has been made that the provision of affordable housing is not viable and it is agreed that a financial contribution in lieu of on-site sheltered affordable accommodation is acceptable. Shared ownership could be considered but it is accepted that Affordable Rented accommodation within a predominantly owner occupied block would be a management issue for all parties concerned. However, the viability appraisal need to be referred to a third party for review.

The size of the units comply with guidelines issued by the Homes & Communities Agency. The location of the development is in a very sustainable, desirable area with access to amenities in the form of public transport, health provision and retail opportunities and is in an area popular for those seeking retirement accommodation.

Waste Services Manager

No response received

Landscape Team

Built-form scale and massing relative to the local character

The proposed retail unit corresponds with the predominantly two storey, semi-detached and short terrace local vernacular. The sheltered apartments do comprise a larger built-form, but this is proposed a reasonable distance from adjacent dwellings and transitions gradually in height for reduced impact.

Landscape setting and design quality

I am concerned the apartment building will be viewed from Elm Grove across a tarmac car park with minimal landscape provision. This does not demonstrate a landscape setting of sufficient quality.

The establishment of a high quality landscape setting is required to ensure the proposals are appropriately integrated with the surrounding local landscape character. I recommend this should include:

- Generous provision for ornamental trees, shrubs and climber on supports as boundary screening
- Planting for attractive outlook views and amenity space for residents, staff and visitors to enjoy
- Secure boundary and access control treatments that don't appear intimidating or out of character.
- Quality, accessible hard landscape surfacing to delineate routes and provide means of access

Safe, intuitive pedestrian access

A safe and naturally intuitive pedestrian route is required for residents, staff or visitors arriving at the sheltered apartments. This should contribute an attractive and accessible pathway, which leads from Elm Grove up to the building main entrance. Surfaced with quality paving, there should also be sufficient visual contrast with the adjacent car park paving.

Parking and servicing provision

Given that parking provision is set to the frontage of the sheltered apartments, I recommend that particular consideration is also required for the appearance and surfacing material selection.

Although provision for on-site car parking seems very limited, I would emphasise that this should not be at the expense of safe and legible pedestrian access.

There needs to be sufficient space to move refuse and recycling units to an appropriate collection point from the designated store. This currently appears to be obstructed by proposed parking bays.

I am satisfied that the above comments can be addressed and resolved by way of appropriate landscape conditions in respect of boundary treatments, soft landscape and hard landscape.

Crime Prevention -Major Apps

Advice provided in respect of safety and security; the level of parking is questioned as it would be of concern if an additional burden was placed on the existing on street parking provision; consideration should be given as to how the electronic gates will work to all visitor access; consideration should be given to relocating the communal access door from the southern end of the western elevation to the northern end of the western elevation in order to safely deliver pedestrians and reduce the opportunity for accidents.

Local Lead Flood Authority HCC

The submissions in respect of surface water run-off have not been prepared in line with new technical standards of March 2015. (Note: a condition requiring drainage details is proposed to address this.)

Planning Policy

Policy Status:

The Local Plan now comprises of the Core Strategy (2011) and the Allocations Plan (2014).

CIL Charging Schedule:

On the 20 February 2013, the Council approved the Havant Borough Community Infrastructure Levy Charging (CIL) Schedule. CIL is payable on new residential floorspace at a rate of £100/sqm in Hayling Island.

Solent Recreation Mitigation Project (SRMP)

The SRMP contribution will be payable in accordance with policy DM24. I have noted that this doesn't appear to have been allowed for in the development costs used in the submitted viability assessment.

Retail Provision:

The front part of the site has most recently been used for retail purposes and is defined as secondary frontage in the adopted Local Plan (Allocations). Policy AL3(4) requires 25% of the units in secondary frontage to be retained in retail (A1) use. I have noted that the proposal includes provision of a ground floor shop unit onto Elm Grove which should help to satisfy the requirements of this policy.

Housing

Part of the site is specifically allocated for residential development in the adopted Allocations Plan (2014) under Policy HY1 (site reference HY13). This gave an indicative number of 14 dwellings. The number indicated in the plan was never intended to be prescriptive and if a satisfactory scheme has been designed that makes better use of what is previously developed land in order to provide further new homes then the principle should be supported. In any case the overall application site is larger than what was allocated. This is acceptable in principle as it is in the defined urban area (CS17).

The proposal will contribute towards the borough's housing requirement of 6,300 new dwellings between 2006 and 2026, in accordance with policy CS9(1). It will also provide accommodation for the ageing population in accordance with policy CS9(6).

Policy CS9(2) requires the provision of affordable housing. At 30% this would equate to 13.5 dwellings. The applicant has submitted information to suggest on site provision is not appropriate or possible (for practical and viability grounds). Their argument against on site provision is supported by case law evidence. I have no objection to the principle of a financial contribution in lieu of affordable housing in this instance. However, the amount payable needs to be tested.

Taking into account viability they have suggested a financial contribution of £120,000 in lieu of affordable housing provision (and to allow the scheme to remain viable). In accordance with the supportive text to Policy CS9 this viability assessment should be 3rd party tested at the developer's expense. Should this viability assessment subsequently be found correct (following 3rd party check) then the proposed financial contribution in lieu would be acceptable. However, it may be found that a larger contribution is possible and appropriate.

Parking

I have read the relevant section of the submitted Transport Statement which seeks to justify the 0.32 spaces per unit proposed. This falls significantly short of the adopted and emerging targets for parking.

- Adopted SPD non allocated = 0.9 spaces for 1 bed, 1.3 spaces for 2 bed
- Emerging SPD (as above but expressed as a minimum)

I am concerned that there may be some reliance on the free parking currently available in the nearby St. Marys Road public car park and at the Co-op (page 20 of the submitted Transport Statement). The availability of these car parks is important to support the local shops and businesses in providing customer parking. Clogging up these spaces with residential parking *could* have implications and undermine the local shops/businesses.

I recognise that there are shops and services and bus routes easily accessible to the site but I remain concerned as to the extent the parking provision falls short of the adopted standards.

Summary

No policy objection to the principle of the development, subject to issues regarding viability and parking being resolved.

Southern Water

There is inadequate capacity in the local network to provide foul sewage disposal to service the development. Either off site works will be required or it will need to be demonstrated that there will be no overall increase in flows into the foul system. An informative is requested that a formal application will need to be made to Southern Water. Initial investigations indicate there is capacity to provide surface water disposal and a further informative is requested in this regards. A condition is requested with respect to foul and surface water sewerage disposal.

Arboriculturalist

No objection to the removal of the trees as they should not be a constraint to development due to their status. However, the requirement for a comprehensive tree planting plan should be conditioned.

Consultant Ecologist

Original comments: The application site is of limited ecological interest but there may be potential for one tree to have moderate potential to support roosting bats. Further clarification is required.

Comments following receipt of further information: Further investigation has concluded that the tree does not offer bat roosting potential. Clarification has also been provided on the requirement for bird nesting habitat compensation. I am content that all ecological matters are now resolved.

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 32

Number of site notices: One

Statutory advertisement: 20/11/2015

Number of representations received: 19

Summary:

1. 14 car parking spaces for 44 flats is of concern and there appears to be no visitor parking provided. Utilising St Mary's Road car park necessitates a walk along a dark alleyway and the need to cross Elm Grove so raising safety concerns. It is not a satisfactory alternative to on site parking. The situation will change should it become a chargeable car park. The survey undertaken is not representative; it is full regularly, particularly during school hours. The situation will also worsen when part of the Hayling Billy car park is taken out of use.
2. Vehicles will have difficulty turning within the site and there will be conflict with delivery and refuse vehicles.
3. Concern whether the health centre has capacity for the new residents.
4. The analysis of vehicle use should not be based on figures taken from outside the area.
5. The congestion in traffic and parking that occurs at school opening and closing times is not taken into account.
6. A supporting photo regarding activity in the vicinity of the vehicular access is misleading as is taken at a time of light traffic and pedestrian usage.
7. There is no risk assessment with respect to proximity to the Fire Station and the impact of traffic during construction.
8. Concern over proximity of mobile phone mast to the development.
9. The three storey building is far in excess of any other building within the area; it will have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties, the bowling green, allotments and the school as well as impacting the skyline over a large area. It will also cause overlooking and overshadowing and will be visible from the AONB. The use of white UPVC windows will make this impact even harsher.
10. The building would be acceptable at two storey and if more car parking was to be provided.
11. Nature of boundary treatments queried.

Officer Comments: *The transport and traffic implications of the development, and its impact upon the character of the area are discussed below. The capacity of the Health Centre to treat additional patients is not considered to be a material consideration for this particular application and is an issue for the NHS to address. A condition can be proposed to require parking details during the construction phase but the approach has to be via Elm Grove. This would be the case for any development proposal upon the site.*

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan and all other material considerations it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Impact upon the character of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity
- (iv) Highway and Parking considerations
- (v) Other Issues

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. The site lies

within a secondary frontage of the Gable Head District Centre and policy AL3 of the adopted Local Plan (Allocations) requires 25% to be retained in retail use. In this regard the proposal replaces the existing retail unit with one of a narrower frontage in order to provide a suitable access along its northern side. The retail frontage is therefore only marginally reduced and it is considered the provision of the ground floor retail unit should help satisfy this requirement. This view has been endorsed by the Planning Policy consultation response.

- 7.3 With respect to the housing proposal the site has specifically been allocated for residential development in the adopted allocations Plan under policy HY1 as site reference HY13. This allocation gave an indicative number of 14 dwellings. This number was not prescriptive and had anticipated a standard dwelling layout. However, the proposed sheltered apartment scheme makes better use of previously developed land in a sustainable location adjacent to the District Centre and Planning Policy have advised that this form of development is acceptable in principle as the site is within the defined urban area. The proposal will contribute towards meeting the borough's housing requirement of 6,300 new dwellings between 2006 and 2026 in accordance with policy CS9(1). It will also provide accommodation for the ageing population in accordance with policy CS9(6) of the Core Strategy.
- 7.4 Policy CS9(2) of the Core Strategy requires the provision of affordable housing and at 30% this would equate to 13.5 dwellings. The applicant has submitted information to suggest on site provision is not appropriate or possible for a sheltered scheme of this kind for both practical and viability grounds. They have supported their argument with case law evidence. With respect to this aspect the Housing Development Officer has advised that Hampshire Home Choice currently has 98 households registered for sheltered housing . The rehousing of these people would enable the larger units they currently reside in to be used more effectively to accommodate families. However, it is appreciated that it would be a difficult management issue to include social units in an owner occupied block. Planning policy has no objection to a financial contribution in lieu of actual provision. However, the amount payable needs to be means tested and this work is in progress. The current offer is £120,000. It is therefore considered that the principle of the proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of the review of the viability submission. The location of the development is in a very sustainable area with access to amenities in the form of public transport, health provision and retail opportunities and so is considered to be a very suitable location for retirement accommodation.

(ii) Impact upon the character of the area

- 7.5 On the Elm Grove frontage, the replacement retail unit with flat above is designed in a traditional two storey hipped roof manner and will relate appropriately to the existing character of the street scene.
- 7.6 For the apartment block behind, elements of all elevations are three storey in height although on the southern side the third floor is provided by a half dormer design. The frontage facing Elm Grove is also stepped up with single and first floor elements to the north and south of the full three storey element which has a height of 11.5m. The building lies 40m back from the Elm Grove frontage and will be viewed either through the previous Pullinger/Tesco car park or the new access to the development located to the north of the replacement retail unit and flat above. At this distance from the Elm Grove frontage it is considered that a development of this scale, with the particular approach taken to its detailed design and massing and which features a significant amount of articulation, will result in a building that will not be detrimental to the character of the Elm Grove street scene. In terms of the wider impact upon the character of the area, to the north of the site is a car park and bowling green and the actual British Legion club is at a distance in excess of 55m; to the west are the open areas of the Allotment Gardens with

a width of 45m and beyond the Allotments are the car park of both Mengham Junior School and, to the north of that, the Recreation Ground. These neighbouring uses are not all public areas but are uses that provide community uses that are visited by the public. Their generally open character provide a spacious land use context for the new building beyond the site itself, and whilst the new development will be clearly prominent in this context, the relationships and distances to the adjoining land uses are considered to be such that the proposal to introduce a three storey building would not, in itself, be detrimental to the character of this particular area. To the south of the site are rear gardens of a terrace of two storey dwellings in Palmerston Road and that detailed relationship in terms of residential amenity is considered in the section below. However in terms of general principles of scale, the fact that the new development will lie some 14.5m off the shared boundary with these properties is considered to mitigate the change in storey heights that will be seen between the existing Palmerston Road development and the new development proposed.

- 7.7 Having regard to the relationship of the development to its surrounding context it is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in respect of its scale, massing and street scene implications to Elm Grove and its wider impact under the requirements of CS16 of the Core Strategy.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

- 7.8 As detailed above the site is only bordered by residential properties on the southern side. The use of the half dormer design results in a lower overall height for the three storey element of 10.5m on this elevation. The distance between the rear of the dwellings and the three storey element with the half dormer roof accommodation is 36m at its closest. This is in excess of the 24m required by the Havant Borough Design Guide SPD for a three to two storey relationship between residential developments. Also on this boundary new fencing is proposed to be provided together with hedging on the side of the proposal. It is therefore considered that in terms of the relationship of the new development to neighbouring residential properties, the impact upon them will be satisfactory under the requirements of Core Strategy policy CS16.
- 7.9 With respect to the amenity of the residents within the sheltered apartment development the ground floor units have doors to outside patios and there is a garden provided on the south side. The wing on the west side of the southern frontage element of the building makes this area secluded from the activity on the Elm Grove frontage. There is scope within the garden and on the boundaries of the site to implement the planting scheme that is considered suitable. In addition amended plans have defined a pedestrian entrance for the development for residents to address the concerns raised by the Landscape Officer in this regard, and secures a route to the apartments which prevents the need for the elderly to cross the car park and conflict with any vehicle turning movements. On this basis it is considered the environment for the residents will be acceptable.

(iv) Highway and parking considerations

- 7.10 The sheltered apartment scheme is provided with 14 car parking spaces which equates to a parking space ratio of 0.32 per flat. This is greater than the one space per 4 units (0.25 per unit) which was the historic standard previously used for similar forms of developments within Havant that have a minimum age condition. This standard is not however referred to in the adopted parking standards as expressed in the Residential Parking SPD. Under those standards the provision falls short of the general parking standard of 0.9 spaces for 1 bed flats and 1.3 spaces for 2 bed flats when spaces are unallocated; in respect of parking for sheltered housing in particular the standard varies between 1 space per unit (general) down to a maximum of 0.5 spaces per unit in Havant town centre. A number of representations received in connection with the application

make reference to car parking issues, and concern has also been expressed by Planning Policy that there may be over reliance on the free parking available in the St Mary's Road car park which is an important facility to support the local shops and businesses in providing customer parking. It has been queried that residential parking in this car park could undermine the local shops/businesses.

- 7.11 In response to these issues the agent has provided various appeal decisions to demonstrate that the level of parking proposed is similar to other sites operated by the applicant and which have been accepted on appeal. It is argued, against the background of their surveys of existing other Churchill developments and the appeal evidence that the level of parking on site will accommodate residents and visitors. However, they have undertaken a survey of the St Mary's Road car park on a Thursday between 0900 and 1600 and on a Saturday between 0900 and 1200 . The maximum percentage of spaces occupied was 71% leaving 16 spaces still available, at 1500 on the Thursday. This is at the time of school pick up and so demonstrates that if there is the need for visitors or carers to park in the car park that there is capacity to accommodate both them and other visitors to the wider District Centre. Against the background of the appeal evidence and the survey data, and when recognising the sustainable location of the development adjacent to a District Centre and with options for alternative modes of transport in the form of a regular bus service, it is considered that the level of car parking proposed for the scheme is acceptable and the highway authority has advised that there is not a parking ground for refusal on the basis that the St Mary's Road car park is for multiple use. There will, however, need to be an age restriction condition included on any decision.
- 7.12 Concern was also raised about the ability to turn on site but further submissions have shown tracking and turning is possible within the site. Access to the main entrance for pedestrians through the car park was not thought desirable for elderly residents but an amendment has developed a pedestrian route to a side entrance for residents on the northern side. A canopy porch is also proposed for this entrance. The distance to this secondary entrance is shorter than to the main one so should indeed be attractive to the residents to use. On this basis the layout of the car park is considered acceptable. Whilst the absence of further landscaping within the car parking area, referred to in the Landscape Officer's response, is regrettable, given the secluded location of the car park within the site and the use of a varied palette of materials to distinguish the various functions of this space, this is not a matter which is considered to be of sufficient weight to justify the refusal of the scheme. Conditions are proposed to address the provision of the car parking and cycle parking.

(v) Other Matters

- 7.13 In view of the potential for contamination from the open storage use on the site conditions are proposed to ensure any potential contamination of the ground is addressed. Conditions can also be imposed to address Environmental Health requests with respect to an air-source scheme and the details of any SUDs scheme. An informative is also proposed to highlight that there may be asbestos upon the site.
- 7.14 With regard to ecological matters, agreement has been reached with the Consultant Ecologist that the development will not prejudice bat and bird habitat. With regard to the impact on the Solent Special Protection Area, this development would increase the number of dwellings within the 5.6km zone identified as significant in potentially increasing recreational pressure on the Solent SPA. Natural England's advice with regard to all new housing development within this zone is that it is likely to have a significant effect on the SPA. The measures of mitigation adopted by the LPA at the end of June 2014 requires a payment of £172 per dwelling to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP) – this is to secure accordance with Policy DM24 of the Allocations Plan 2014. The required financial

contribution has been offered and this can be secured through a S106 agreement.

7.15 Any S106 will also need to secure an appropriate financial contribution in lieu of affordable housing on the site, as discussed at Paragraph 7.4 above. The figure currently offered has still to be agreed, and members will be updated of progress in this issue prior to the Committee meeting. The development will also be liable to a CIL payment.

8 Conclusion

8.1 It is considered that the proposed development would make a valuable contribution to the borough's housing requirements by providing retirement accommodation on a site allocated in the Local Plan, and also provides a retail unit on the Elm Grove frontage to meet the policy requirements for the secondary retail frontage. The assessment provided concludes that the form of the development, including its 3 storey height, is appropriate having regard to the site context, and that being in a sustainable location the car parking provision is acceptable on the basis of the development being age restricted. It is therefore concluded that subject to a Section 106 securing the payment of the SRMP payment and an agreed contribution in lieu of affordable housing that the proposal is considered acceptable.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Economy be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/15/00950 subject to:

(A) The entering into of a S106 Agreement, acceptable to the solicitor to the Council, to secure the required SRMP contribution and contribution in lieu of the provision of affordable housing; and

(B) Conditions to address the following matters, and any others that are considered appropriate (the detailed wording of such to be delegated to the Executive Head of Planning and Economy):

1. Timing condition
2. Age restriction condition
3. Details of materials
4. Details of hardsurfacing and its implementation
5. Details of landscaping and its implementation.
6. Details of means of enclosure and their implementation.
7. Survey and mitigation of ground contamination
8. Details of foul and surface water drainage.
9. Details of any air source heat pump provision and an acoustic assessment.
10. Details of parking provision during construction
11. Development to be in accordance with approved plans

Note: Special Informatives to cover:

1. SWA requirements
2. Potential for and treatment of asbestos
3. Protected species advice

Appendices:...